



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Against war, there is one serious consideration, which both Japanese and Russian responsible statesmen have certainly well weighed. However long continued and deadly the conflict of arms might be, —and it is scarcely possible to overestimate the disastrousness of it—the two powers would be left at the end practically where they are now. Their Asiatic fleets are so nearly matched that decisive victory would scarcely be possible to either. The same would be the case on land, considering the remoteness of the Russian forces from their home base. The war would leave the two armies shattered and exhausted on the borders of Manchuria, unable because of their weakness and of the ruined treasuries at home to proceed further. Of what use, then, to fight? these statesmen may well ask themselves. Why not reach a sensible understanding, before the commission of such a monstrous and ruinous piece of folly?

With Russia another consideration weighs perhaps even more than the foregoing. If she should wage a successful campaign against Japan, she knows very well that England and other powers would not allow her to retain the fruits of her victory. Korean independence is already under the joint guarantee of Great Britain and Japan, and the powers interested in the trade of the East would not allow her to exclude their commerce from Manchuria or even to retain a permanent hold on the country.

Japan likewise is influenced to a policy of moderation by the consideration that a conflict with the Russian colossus might, even if she were not vanquished outright, so weaken and exhaust her as to put back her progress for many years to come.

Under these circumstances it is not likely that the conflict will be allowed to come to actual fighting. Even if moral considerations had little or no weight on either side, prudent self-regard would dictate to both abstention from a course so insane and ruinous as a war would be. That there are moral considerations at both the Czar's court and the Mikado's, deeply affecting the progress of events, we have not the least doubt, even though it may be difficult to read their influence on the surface.

As we write, the dispatches indicate that the motives to peace have prevailed, that the crisis is measurably past, and that war will be avoided. Our own and other governments are interesting themselves in averting the catastrophe. A treaty between Russia and Japan is reported to be under way which provides for the final evacuation of Manchuria and for the security of Russian railway interests in the country. Such a pacific outcome of the situation is the only sane one, and we cannot yet believe that the two great progressive and intelligent powers which have been facing each other with so much suspicion and menace, will so far abandon not only all humanity, but all sense, as to plunge headlong into the dark and deadly abyss of war.

Editorial Notes.

Alaskan Boundary.

Senator Lodge has been making preliminary arrangements in London for the meeting of the Alaska boundary commission on the 3d of September. The agents of the two countries have already prepared their "cases," synopses of which have been published in the press. The counter "cases" have also been drawn up and abstracts of them published. These arguments and counter arguments present in connected and exhaustive way what has all along been contended on each side. There is little in them that is new. They furnish a curious illustration of how radically different arguments may be drawn from the same documents. The chief point of contention in the dispute is as to the possession of the heads of certain inlets of the ocean, more particularly of Lynn Canal. The United States claims that the strip of territory along the sea coast which she received from Russia is composed entirely of land, and runs around the heads of the inlets; Great Britain, that it is part land and part water, and takes in the heads of some of the inlets. The difference in contention arises chiefly out of the interpretation to be put upon the treaty between Great Britain and Russia in 1825, since which time the strip, as claimed in our government's contention, has been in undisputed possession of Russia and then of the United States, until the discovery of gold in the Klondyke. We have not been able to see how a commission, composed as the present one is of three on a side, each of whom is probably absolutely certain that his government is right in the matter, can expect to reach any settlement. We shall hope, however, that an honorable decision of the case may be arrived at by the commission. If not, the strip of territory will still remain in the possession of our government, and a good deal of unpleasant feeling is liable to continue over the matter. What we should all desire in the case is simple justice, to whichever party this may give the disputed territory.

The most important event of the past month in connection with the international arbitration movement was the visit of the International Arbitration Group of the French Parliament to members of the British House of Commons on the 22d of July. This Group, as our readers already know, is a non-partisan association in the French Chamber of Deputies, formed some months ago for the promotion of international arbitration in general and, in particular, treaties of arbitration between France and other countries. The leader of the movement is Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant, one of the

French members of the Hague Court, and it was he that headed the deputation to London. The visit was planned at the time of the visit of King Edward to Paris, and was made at about the time of the return visit to England of President Loubet, who was most warmly received in London. The purpose of the deputation was to bring about a similar organization in the House of Commons and to promote the negotiation of a general treaty of arbitration between the two countries. About one hundred and fifty members of the House of Commons joined in a dinner to the visitors. Among the eminent Englishmen present at the dinner were Premier Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Sir William Houldsworth and Earl Percy. Mr. d'Estournelles, replying to Sir W. Houldsworth's welcome, said that conditions had never been more favorable for coöperation for peace between the two countries, and urged that the favorable moment be utilized to secure the fullest use of the Hague Court. Premier Balfour moved a vote of thanks to Mr. d'Estournelles for his great services in promoting the world's peace, and said it was the deliberate intention of the two countries to put on a permanent basis some organization to prevent the causes of petty friction which tended to lead to international difficulties. A number of short speeches were made, and the occasion seems to have been one of unusual interest. On the next day the French Senators and Deputies were received by the Lord Mayor of London, and speeches of like import to those of the preceding day were made. The *Chicago Post* is right in urging that such an arbitration organization should be effected "in every national legislative body in Europe and America."

**Death of
G. W. F. Holls.**

We regret to have to record the sudden death of George Frederick W. Holls of New York. Though a man of much ability, of wide scholarship and the head of a strong law firm in New York, he had not come much into general note till he was sent in 1899 by our government as one of the United States Commissioners to the Hague Conference. Since that time, because of his services at The Hague, he has been widely known and honored throughout the civilized world. He was one of the most active, earnest and influential men in the Conference. He served on the Arbitration Committee, and was one of the sub-committee who drafted the now memorable Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Controversies. At the crisis of the Conference, some three weeks after its opening, when the German delegation took the stand on arbitration which paralyzed the proceedings for several days, he went on Ambassador White's request to

Berlin with Dr. Zorn of the German Commission, with whom he had been educated in Germany. He had interviews with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the War Minister, and succeeded by his conciliatory and wise representations in inducing the government to give such instructions to its representatives at The Hague as restored harmony in the proceedings. This was perhaps the most important single service — certainly the most delicate and difficult one — rendered during the Conference, and justly entitles Mr. Holls to the gratitude of mankind. After the Conference Mr. Holls published the only adequate account of the proceedings which has appeared in this country, "The Peace Conference at The Hague" (The Macmillan Company, New York), which ought to be read by all students of the arbitration movement. Mr. Holls was at his death a member of the Hague Court, having been appointed some two years ago by the government of Siam one of the two representatives of that country in the Tribunal. He was only forty-five years of age at his death. If he had lived, there is reason to believe that he would have rendered most important service in the work of the Court and in the future development of international law, in which he took much interest.

**Professor
Westlake.**

In his most interesting address as chairman at the annual meeting of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, King's Hall, Holborn Restaurant, London, July 1, Professor Westlake, one of the English members of the Hague Court, strongly criticised the action of the British government for employing violence against Venezuela and for not being willing from the beginning to submit all the questions of claims to arbitration, to the Hague Court. "What possible justification," he asked, "could any one offer for not submitting the first as well as the second-class claims to arbitration? It was perfectly possible for any court of justice to decide such a matter impartially." The belief among governments that in the case of the use of force against their subjects the national honor could be vindicated only by the employment of force in return he considered one of the greatest mischiefs working among nations, which ought to be extirpated. The Hague Court he considered to be much less likely to be guilty of partiality than any private commission that could be appointed. He regretted that because of opposition in the United States the Alaska boundary dispute could not have been referred to a real arbitration tribunal, to the Hague Court. He was pleased at the present cordial relations between France and England, and thought the time most opportune for settling all points of disagreement between them, either by arbitration or by negotiation, which in case of certain old problems he thought

much better than arbitration. The whole address was an able and earnest plea for the extension of the reign of goodwill and law as far and as fast as possible in international affairs.

The editor of the *Lend a Hand* Rec-
 Philanthropies
 as Peace Agents. ord comments with fine insight on the
 part played by common philanthropies in
 hastening the peace of the world:

"It is an inspiring thought that the peace of the world is to be hastened by its common philanthropies as much as through any other agency. It is not alone the commercial needs that are to break down walls and open doors and send armies back to the fields. It is the larger needs and sorrows and inspirations of the human heart and life. The need of the mariner scudding along the coast has set a chain of lights around the world. The upheaval of a volcano and the destruction of a city, the killing breath of a plague, or the angry waters of an overflowing river, will set hearts beating together so closely that in the common pulse of sympathy all thought of war is forgotten. Thus are disasters overruled for good. Thus are lessons of international love forced upon the nations. Thus, in the economy of God, is the mystery of disaster fathomed. And all this thought has come to us through reading a great package of letters touching one phase or another of international philanthropy, work for the sick, for prisoners, for the crushed nationalities and peoples, as just now the Jews in Kishineff, and a little while ago for the Armenians in Turkey. It is all binding the peoples together. It sends home the lesson that

"Pity and need
 Make all flesh kin. There is no caste in blood,
 Which runneth of one hue, nor caste in tears,
 Which trickle salt with all; neither comes man
 To birth with tilka-mark stamped on the brow,
 Nor sacred thread on neck."

"We learn to know our brothers through need and pity, both sent of God."

Brevities.

. . . The Twelfth International Peace Congress will meet at Rouen, France, on the 22d of September and continue for four days. The committee on organization, to coöperate with the Peace Bureau in arranging for the meetings, consists of Frederic Passy, Emile Arnaud, Gaston Moch, Professor Charles Richet, Lucien le Foyer and other leading French peace workers. The Congress will be followed by the Conference of the International Law Association at Antwerp, Belgium, on the 29th of September.

. . . The vacancy caused in the British section of the Alaskan Boundary Commission by the death of Justice Armour has been filled by the appointment of Allen Bristol Aylesworth of Toronto, Canada, one of the ablest lawyers in the Dominion.

. . . It is already announced that the feature of next winter's naval bill, now in preparation by the House Naval Committee, will be five new battleships of 16,000 tons each.

. . . It is gratifying to learn that more than two hundred thousand people have been replaced upon their land in the Transvaal, fed for months, assisted in various ways to reconstitute their homes, to restock their barns, and to grow sufficient food to satisfy their immediate wants. But for the great sin of the past all this exhibition of British generosity would, however, have been uncalled for.

. . . Bishop J. W. Hamilton, of the M. E. Church, says he believes "it to be the duty of the Christian Church and of all philanthropists to aid in putting aside both the agency and the spirit of force in the settlement of difficulties, whether between nations or individuals."

. . . The *Morning Star*, commenting on the cordiality of President Loubet's reception in London, says: "All the European rulers have been rather cordial lately, and it ought to reduce the price of rifled cannon and warships."

. . . Andrew D. White's proposal of professorships in American colleges to train men for public affairs, for public administration, international diplomacy, etc., has not met with much approval in the general press. But the idea is right, just the same, and will make its way to victory in some future when we have learned that there is something more noble and useful than "pull" politics.

. . . The *Chicago Tribune*, which has for years been collecting statistics of accidents on the Fourth of July, records for this year fifty-two deaths outright and three thousand six hundred and sixty-five wounded. The property loss by fire was over four hundred thousand dollars. The *Tribune* does not tell us how much loss of character the stupid nonsense of the day cost the nation.

. . . Commenting on Secretary Root's remark at Junction City, Kansas, that "war always does come, sooner or later," George T. Angell says, in *Our Dumb Animals*: "We say that there is no more need of wars between nations than between individuals,—that they are a relic of barbarism, *the concentration of all human crimes*,—and that to teach the young of our country that '*wars must come*,' and so to be constantly expecting and preparing for them, is *the devil's teaching*."

. . . Secretary Hay, at the instance of the American Minister to Caracas, has invited the Czar of Russia to name, from the members of the Hague Court, three arbitrators to constitute the tribunal which is to determine and settle the questions submitted to it under the United States-Venezuelan Claims Treaty. This action of our State Department makes it clear that the Hague Tribunal can be utilized even where a convention goes no farther than to provide for a claims commission. It is a most admirable step.

. . . In *Friedensblätter* for July, published at Esslingen, Germany, Otto Umfrid of Stuttgart, one of the leading peace advocates of Germany, has an article entitled "*Die Formel der Abrüstung*," in which he makes a powerful and impressive plea for a truce of armaments, a colonial treaty among the colonizing powers, and finally a gradual proportional disarmament, which he shows to be entirely practicable at the present time if the governments only were willing to try it, and would proceed in the way suggested.